

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES

+ + + + +

BASIC OVERVIEW SESSIONS

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,

MAY 13, 2008

+ + + + +

## PROCEEDINGS

### Slide One:

**Dr. ALBRO:** Good morning. I think that buzzer means that I'm on. I want to welcome you all to the webinar this morning.

I'm Liz Albro; I'm the associate Associate Commissioner for the Teaching and Learning Division for the National Center for Education Research.

And you all have joined our general basic overview for funding opportunities at the Institute of Education Science.

A couple of administrative notes before we begin. I want to ask all of you on the listening end to keep your phones on mute so that we don't get any interference or background noise.

If you have questions that you would like me to answer, use your chat box. I think it's in the bottom right hand corner of your webinar screen. Use your chat box, and my colleague, Kristen Lauer, who has joined me from the Special Education Center, will make sure that I see them.

The way this will work is I'm going to pause at particular sections and I will address questions at that time. If there are points of clarification and you think of them, go ahead and send them. But just know that I'll answer the questions all together at three or four different places throughout the presentation.

All right, now I also have to warn you that this is a little bit awkward, because there's no feedback for me, so I'm going to try to go at the right pace. But if I am talking too quickly, please let me know via the chat.

Okay, let's get going.

### Slide Two:

So, here's what I had hoped to do this morning. First, I'm going to provide you with an overview of the Institute of Education Sciences and give you a little bit of history in terms of our legislative mission and our priorities.

I'm going to talk with you about the research priorities that both of the research centers have.

I'm going to describe for you our currently available grant programs and discuss the topics that exist within them, the types of questions that are appropriate for those programs.

I'm going to spend some time discussing our research goals, which I'm sure many of you know are one of the unique functions, or the unique properties, of the IES research grant program.

And I'm going to give a little bit of information about preparing and submitting an application, and talk a little bit about the peer review process after you submit the application.

### Slide Three and Four:

So first, to begin. Who are we, and what is the Institute of Education Sciences? We were authorized in November of 2002, and we have a particular legislative mission that Congress has given to us that we need to uphold as an institute.

We have three overarching goals, if you will—charges from Congress. The first is that we are required to describe the conditions and progress of education in the United States.

For those of you who are familiar with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), this is much of the work that they do. Assessments like the NAEP [National Assessment of Educational Progress] involve doing exactly this, describing what is going on in education and its achievements in our nation today.

Our second legislative mission is to identify education practices that improve academic achievement as well as access to education opportunities. Education practices should be understood broadly to encompass things all the way from curriculum to instructional practices to policies.

And finally, we are also charged with the mission of evaluating the effectiveness of federal and other education programs. Most of that work is the responsibility of the National Center for Education Evaluation. All this we do through the research center's fund of that work as well.

**Slide Five:**

For those of you who are visually inclined, here's a picture. So we have an Office of the Director, and Russ Whitehurst is our current director. He is advised by a presidentially appointed National Board for the Education Sciences. And he oversees the four centers of the Institute of Education Sciences.

I'm going to talk about the two research centers primarily today: the National Center for Education Research, and the National Center for Special Education Research. Many of our requests for applications are highly similar, with differences as a function of topics.

We also have the National Center for Education Statistics, and the National Center for Education Evaluation.

**Slide Six:**

For those of you here, this is one of the most important pages that I'm going to put up. This is our website, and there is a tremendous amount of information available on this website. If you have not been to our website, although I think most of you have because that's how you signed up for the webinar, but I would encourage you to explore it carefully.

A couple of things to note. The first is that on the blue bar, the far right, second from the left, we have the funding opportunities button. That is where you can go to get information about the currently available requests for applications. That provides you with links to all the PDFs and any information that we have about available technical assistance.

We also have, above the search button, the NewsFlash. If you have not signed up for the NewsFlash, I think this is a very helpful resource that we have where you can get information on your e-mail about when new RFAs are released, when new reports are released, when new awards are made, when there are new data collection efforts occurring. So please, take the time to sign up for the news flash NewsFlash as well.

Finally, I want to encourage you to explore both the NCER and the NCSER web links. Within those links you can find a programs and projects description, which will

give you links to all the abstracts of all the research that we have funded to date. That will give you a good sense of the kind of research we have funded, and whether the projects that you're proposing are appropriate for our research center.

**Slide Seven:**

What kind of research projects would we like to be supporting? We have a set of priorities that one could say “constrain,” (but let's say “enable”) a series of different questions for us to ask. So what are our priorities?

**Slide Eight:**

We have four long-term research goals that the Institute of Education Sciences as a whole shares.

First, we are requested to develop or identify programs, practices, policies, and approaches that enhance academic achievement. (Off-topic interruption)

All right, guys, I don't know who's underlining, but you're underlining it for all of us. So, I don't know if we want to do this because I don't know if it's going to impact people's ability to see the slides.

(back on-topic)

Our second goal is to identify what does not work, and thereby encourage innovation and future research.

(Off-topic)

Ah, here we go, thanks.

(Back on-topic)

We are also expected to support research that explains variations in effectiveness of education programs, practices, policies, and approaches.

And finally, we are asked to support efforts to get the research findings out for public consumption. Right, so that the practitioners, the folks in schools, know what our research efforts look like.

Now part of the thing that you will notice, that if you look through our requests for applications, is that there are constraints in terms of the kind of research that we support.

**Slide Nine:**

The one way to think about this has to do with what are the outcomes of interest for the Institute, and what are the points that we can change, right, and the research paradigms and dependent and independent variables.

In the context of prekindergarten, note there are outcomes of interest involved: readiness for schooling, and developmental outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities. That second outcome is constrained or limited to the National Center for Special Education Research.

**Slide Ten:**

Within kindergarten through grade 12, which is where the bulk of our research efforts have been focused, we are interested in research that addresses each these following outcomes of interest. Again, you'll notice that these are academic outcomes primarily.

We are interested in outcomes in the area of reading and writing, improving achievement in those areas; and in mathematics and science education.

We're interested in understanding how best to support the behaviors, or to help students learn the behaviors and social skills that support learning in school, and successful transitions to post-school opportunities. Again, this is particularly for students with disabilities, that second group.

And finally, we are also interested in understanding how best to support the functional skills that support independent living for students with disabilities.

I want to note, for those of you who are interested in supporting achievement in those content areas, that under reading and writing, we request research that looks at how to improve literacy in the content areas, if you will.

So if you are interested in understanding how to improve learning in the context of social studies, you can prepare a proposal under the reading and writing application. And I recommend that you talk with the relevant program officer to help you think about how to frame a proposal that makes sense for that achievement area.

#### **Slide Eleven:**

Finally, it's really important to note that although the bulk of our work is K-12, we are also actively seeking applications in the area of postsecondary education as well as adult education.

We want to support research that helps us understand how to improve the enrollment levels in postsecondary education as well as the completion of postsecondary education, particularly for those learners who are typically at risk of not entering postsecondary or not completing postsecondary.

That category can include students who have not performed well academically in secondary school. It could also include, for example, English language learners.

And finally, we have an active interest in supporting research in the area of adult education. For any of you who read the newspaper, you probably have seen that our literacy and numeracy rates among adults is much lower than you would anticipate or expect.

And we are actively seeking applications who want to come in and understand how best to serve adults who have gone through formal schooling, or not, and whose literacy and numeracy skills are lower than one would expect.

#### **Slide Twelve:**

So what can you propose to change? In the context of our requests for applications, we have five general areas where proposals can make a revision or a change or modification.

One would be in the area of curriculum. And understand, when we talk about curriculum, curriculum should be thought of broadly. So you could propose to create a new unit, maybe something that's only several weeks long. Or you could propose to create a new entire year or two years' worth of materials within a particular content area.

We also support research that's looking particularly at instruction, at the delivery of instruction. So perhaps you want to propose a study where you're looking at how frequently children are exposed to particular types of vocabulary words. So you're not necessarily creating a new curriculum, but you're revising the instruction or organization

of materials which you already have access to. That is a type of project that we are interested in supporting.

We also support a series of research projects in the area of assessment. And that goes across all of our topics. And within assessment, we're interested in supporting the development of new assessments, both formative and summative. And we're interested in supporting assessments that can be used to support instruction.

One of the things we know is that teachers can provide instruction that is targeted to the needs of their learners only if they have a good sense of where their learners are.

Unfortunately, we don't have as many assessment tools as we would like that answer that question. So that would be one type of project you could apply for under the assessment goal.

We also support research that examines how best to support and improve the quality of the education workforce. These projects go from looking at para-educators who are working perhaps in classrooms with special education students, all the way up through to developing education leaders, like principals and your vice principals.

And finally, we are interested supporting research efforts that look at systems-level programs and policies. And one of the things that states and districts are often interested in knowing is whether a particular policy has had the impact that they would expect on improving student achievement or improving the outcomes. And we also support research in those areas.

### **Slide Thirteen and Fourteen:**

Before I move into the specific description of our currently available requests for applications, I want to just check and see if we have any questions.

We have one question, but I'm going to hold that for later in the talk.

So what's currently available? What could you apply to? Within the 2009 RFAs, we have, it's five general categories. Although I want to note that there are, I think it's actually seven requests for applications when you look across the two centers.

The main requests for applications that we have are our education research grant programs. We have two RFAs: one for the National Center for Education Research, the other for the National Center for Special Education Research.

The CFDA numbers for those, for the National Center for Ed Research, 84.305A. And for Special Education it's 84.324A.

When I go through and talk about our research goals and our topics, please note that there's a lot of similarity and a lot of overlap between those two programs. I will try to point out ways in which they're different.

We also support training grant programs, both predoctoral and postdoctoral. The predoctoral research training grant programs are only available through the National Center for Education Research, although we do also support special education functions as well.

Both centers have postdoctoral research training grant opportunities where institutions or teams of researchers can propose to put together postdoctoral programs for training pre- and postdoctoral fellows.

We have an RFA seeking work in the National Research and Development Centers. We have three new topics in that area, and I'll talk about those in a few minutes.

We have two new RFAs this year that have not been released before. One is targeting statistical and research methodology in education. We're really looking to support research from methodologists who are thinking about new techniques to use in education research, or who would like to continue their understanding how best to run randomized clinical trials, for example, in the context of education research, and how to interpret data that emerge from those findings.

And finally, we have a new request for application on the evaluation of state and local education programs and policies. The goal here is for both researchers and states and local districts to work together to propose projects where current or anticipated state and local policies can be evaluated.

I'm going to start first with our general programs. Within our education research programs, and again within our special education research programs, the first thing you need to do is select the topics. And in many ways you can think of the topic as the content of your proposal.

We've tried to categorize and classify these as related to those outcomes and of interests that I talked about at the outset, where you are really trying to affect student learning in these categories.

**Slide Fifteen:**

For the first topic is reading and writing. And again, as I noted before, reading and writing encompass not simply the act of reading and writing for reading and writing's sake.

So it's not only research in English language arts or in reading, but we are also interested in supporting research that looks at ways to improving reading and writing and acquiring information from text in the content areas, in, say, the area of social studies or history.

In addition, we have our second topic is in mathematics and science education. I think that's pretty self-explanatory.

We also have a program on cognition and student learning. And this is the closest to basic research that we sponsor. And this topic area is really drawing on, or requesting, that the research efforts of cognitive scientists be brought out of the laboratory and into the K-12 classroom.

The goal here is really to take all that knowledge that we've acquired over the past 30 to 40 years from the research efforts of cognitive science, and again, bring it to the classroom.

I want to note right now that we have a brand--this topic is actually now also being competed under the special education RFA, has a similar mission, but the focus there would be on students at risk or designated with special education status.

Our fourth topic, it's actually two topics, but it's been compressed into one here, is teacher quality. We are requesting applications that look at how to improve teaching teacher quality. You can propose a project that looks at developing teachers in areas of reading and writing, or you can propose to develop teachers in areas of mathematics and science education.

Please note that at this point in time, we are only supporting research efforts with in-service teachers. We are not supporting research at this time with pre-service teachers.

One of our newer content areas is the social and behavioral context for academic learning. The goal here is to support research efforts that look at how to improve classroom management, which would be one way to think about this: to improve peer to peer interaction in the context of classrooms.

Clearly, classrooms are a social context, and we are interested in supporting research that helps us understand how to keep the classroom social dynamics working, as it were, right, in a way that it supports academic development.

Within our systems and policy division, we support these following three main topics:

We have an education leadership program. As I mentioned, we are interested in understanding better how to prepare and develop principals, system assistant principals, and other individuals who are in leadership roles within the context of school systems.

We have a program also in education policy, finance, and systems. This is a very broad category and encompasses research that goes from cost accounting and understanding how to distribute financial resources within a school system, to looking at large policies, perhaps teacher assessment incentive policies, perhaps a policy that's relevant to [-- trying to think of a good example here]—say, the use of assessments in classroom; there's a range of different ones.

And finally, we have, again this is a relatively new topic for us, a topic in postsecondary education, where we are particularly interested in supporting research that looks at postsecondary outcomes for students at risk of not entering college or community college or any through-postsecondary training.

#### **Slide Sixteen:**

We also have four additional topics that point to particular needs that we have identified within the education community, as it were.

One of the things that we noted in our general reading and writing programs was that we didn't get nearly as many applications as we would like, in the area of adolescent and adult literacy. So we have put out a special topic, a separate topic, specifically requesting applications in the area of struggling adolescent and adult readers and writers.

These are learners who don't fall under the special education category. These are not learners who are receiving special education services, but are clearly in need of additional assistance in order to get to grade level.

We would like to know better how to serve those individuals, and the research base in this area is remarkably thin. So we would like to see more work in this area.

Similarly, we in the research community are still trying to understand best how to serve middle and high school learners and how to create environments, schools, and classroom structures that support the need of these middle and high school students.

Again, the focus is really on children who are struggling to achieve, and who are at risk for dropping out in middle and high school. And if that's an area of interest for you, I would recommend you look at that topic.

Going backwards now, to the beginning of our school education type, we also have a program in early childhood programs and policies. Although in the past it has been possible to put in a proposal for preschool learning in the context of reading and writing, or mathematics and science, we've decided to pull this category out and address it separately.



In part, this reflects the reality that much of early childhood education is comprehensive in nature, and that it becomes difficult to put together proposals that focus only on literacy and structure, only in numeracy instruction at that age.

Finally, we have again a new topic that competed for the first time last year, in education technology, where we're really hoping that we can get some innovative work being supported looking at how to leverage the use of technology in the context of education and learning settings.

**Slide Seventeen:**

Now within the Special Education Research Center, you will notice a lot of overlap, but there are also some differences that are unique to the special education program.

First, as within the NCER RFA, there is an early intervention and early childhood special education topic. It's important to note that in this topic, on only special education, we support research in infants and toddlers for those individuals who have been identified as at risk for developing disabilities.

We have a program looking at reading, writing, and language development. Again, it's clear that oral language development is a critical skill for children at risk for becoming identified as in need of special education services. So we support research that's not only focused on reading and writing within special education, but also in supporting oral language.

We have a program topic in the area of mathematics and science education for special education students.

We also have a program looking at social and behavioral outcomes, again to support learning.

Finally, we have a topic area here on transition outcomes for special education secondary students. For those of you who work in the area of special education, you know that when students and secondary education, when they can no longer receive services, there is a need to understand how to support those students transitioning out of the school setting and to provide them with the ongoing support that they need.

**Slide Eighteen:**

As I mentioned before, for the first time this year, we have a cognition and student learning in special education program. Again, the hope here is that the research that we have completed over the past 30 to 40 years in the area of cognitive science can be used to help construct better learning environments, learning situations, learning tasks, for students who are receiving special education services.

We also support research under special education looking at teacher quality—how do we prepare teachers or provide professional development for teachers in the area of special education?

There's a category here called related services. For related services, this includes things like understanding best how to develop and use IEPs, for example, or other family service plans.

And I would encourage that if you have a program that's relevant to the delivery of special education services, if you have a research question, and you're not sure where it fits, you should probably talk with the program officer under related services to see if your question fits well within that category.

Finally, we have two more categories. Again, this is a new category for the Special Education Center: systemic interventions and policies for special education. For this topic, we are seeking to support research that's looking more broadly, if you will, at the system or district level, at the local level, trying to understand how policies implemented at those levels influence the achievement level of students who are receiving special education services.

And finally, if there is anyone here on the line who's interested in understanding better how to improve the academic achievement of students in on the autism spectrum: we do have a particular research topic which is in that area.

I think I'm going to pause here, and then we'll talk about the training grant program.

Here's a question. For the special education program, under teacher quality, is it in-service, pre-service, or both? The special education program, as well as the National Center for Education Research, is limited to only supporting research in the in-service area.

Unfortunately, with the institute's mission to try to draw the links between teacher quality, teacher development, and student achievement, it becomes very difficult to do that within a 5 year time period. So at this point, we are only supporting research looking at in-service teacher quality.

Are there any other questions relevant to those topics at this point? No. I'm getting a no.

Let's move on to our other requests for applications.

### **Slide Nineteen:**

We support education research grants. So, for institutions who are listening to the webinar this morning, it is important to note that we are recompeting this year our predoctoral programs. So if you are interested in establishing a new predoctoral program in the education sciences, we are competing that this year.

This supports the preparation of doctoral-level students and looks to build bridges across different disciplinary approaches to understanding questions related to education.

I think I mentioned this before, but I just want to repeat it here, that if you are interested in including special education as part of a predoctoral training program, you would still apply under the National Center for Education Research program, and you are permitted to do so.

For those of you interested in establishing a postdoctoral program where you can bring in two, probably two postdoctoral fellows each year over five years, you can apply either under the National Center for Education Research or the National Center for Special Education Research.

And this really is purposely designed to support the training of postdoctoral fellows to perhaps come in with a background that is related to education research, but who have not had the opportunity to develop skills that are specific to looking at questions in education research.

So for example, perhaps you're training within cognitive science, you know a lot about learning, but you do not have a lot of experience conducting education research in the field.

For those of you who don't know me, my background's in cognitive science, so that's an easy example for me to use.

**Slide Twenty:**

We also have, as I noted earlier, we are competing three national centers, research and development centers this year. There are three separate topics. Again, these are larger grants; they are up to \$10 million over 5 years.

The three topics that we're currently competing are teacher effectiveness, where we are seeking applications that propose to identify what makes an effective teacher. And then also propose to develop a form of N an assessment tool, or a tool that can be used by schools and districts to identify which teachers are on the path to developing well, and which teachers will need additional support.

We are also recompeting our National Center on Rural Education. So we are looking for applications from universities, from institutions, which are interested in putting together an research and development (R&D) center that looks particularly at the problems relevant and related to rural education.

And finally, our third topic this particular year is the National R&D Center on Turning Around Low Performing Schools. Again, we know this is a challenge, that we have a lot of schools that fit into this category, and we don't have a lot of answers necessarily about how best to serve students who are in those schools.

**Slide Twenty-one:**

One of our brand new requests for applications this year is the statistical and research methodology in education topic. The goal here is to provide support for research which intends to advance education research methodologies and statistical analyses.

One example of this might be, for example, trying to understand how to report out effect sizes. For those of you in research, reporting out effect sizes has become something that everyone does, but we don't necessarily have good guidance on what's the right statistical tool to use, whether effect sizes -- how do you know whether it's a small, medium, or large effect size. So this is just one example.

You could also look at statistical methods in terms of how best to perhaps use growth modeling for something new that I can't even think of.

So what we hope this particular RFA will do for us that we will have at the end of however many years, a wide range of methodological and statistical tools that will enable education scientists to conduct rigorous education research.

**Slide Twenty-Two:**

Our last RFA that's currently available is the evaluation of state and local education programs and policies. Again, the goal here is that IES hopes to provide support for rigorous evaluations of state or local education programs or policies implemented by state or local education agencies.

Here there's a recognition that the research budgets of states and local education agencies are often not large enough to support evaluating programs and policies that are being implemented. And we are hoping that through this request for applications we will be able to support efforts occurring in the state and local education levels.

If you have any questions about this section, please send them.

So, for all of the research grant topics, are proposals from state or local education agencies scored on an equitable or competitive basis with universities? Is there a bias or preference for university projects and researchers?

I think that if you look at the research projects that we have funded to date, you will see that there is a preponderance of university projects, projects that have come through universities.

I think that this reflects two things. It reflects the fact that most of the research projects, or the proposals that we get, come from researchers. They come from folks at universities. We tend to see fewer projects that come from state and local agencies.

I think that certainly our evaluation of state and local education programs and policies is a recognition that we would like to see more projects coming out of state and local settings.

I hope that answers your question.

We have another here. For education research training programs, for the training RFA, is there a priority on teachers, or would related fields such as speech language therapy, counseling, school psychology, be viewed as a priority also?

If the school proposes a training program, it is to support the development of education and science researchers who would be in a position to then come in and apply for funding through the IES research programs. So this is a capacity-building exercise, as it were.

So there's nothing to preclude researchers from proposing to develop programs that are in those areas other than education science, sort of straight as it were, what you would need to do is build an argument as to why your training program fits within our particular set of research goals and priorities.

Clearly we then, we have sort of these social and behavioral categories both within the National Center for Education Research, and the National Center for Special Education Research. And it may very well be that the program that you're thinking about would fit well with developing researchers who would be well positioned to apply for them.

Another question: Are for-profit companies eligible to apply for funding for all of these research programs? If not, specify which ones.

Well, actually, for-profit companies are in fact eligible to apply for all of the funding opportunities. The only ones -- well, let me take that back. They are eligible to apply for the Education Research and the Special Education Research grant opportunity. I think also they would be eligible under the statistical and research methodology programs.

It is unlikely that they would be in a position where they could apply for training. I think the training grants need to come out of universities.

And I actually don't know off the top of my head, but I would think, for the evaluation of state and local agencies, there may be additional restrictions. And I'd encourage you to look at the request for applications.

For the evaluation of state and local education programs and policies, where can I find tax-past funded grants, and where can I find the RFA? Is this open to researchers, or just to school districts?

There are several questions here. The first is that we never competed this before; this is the first time we've had this competition, so there are no previous funded grants. That's the first.

The RFA, if you go to the [ies.ed.gov/funding](https://ies.ed.gov/funding), the page on our website, that request for applications is available there, as are all of the others I described.

Then the final part was, is this open to research or just to school districts? I believe that we don't specify the direction of the partnership. I think the expectation is that there will be partnerships between state and local school districts and researchers. And I don't think we specify who needs to come in as the lead investigator.

If you have other questions that occur to you, go ahead and send them to us through the chat box, and I'll answer them at the next section.

But, given that we have to be mindful of time, I'm going to press on to a description of our research goals.

#### **Slide Twenty-three and Twenty four:**

Within the Institute of Education Sciences, as I've noted, we have a set of research goals within our education research base RFAs. In many ways, this is a unique structure, and it reflects our hope that researchers will put in proposals that focus tightly in on one of these goal questions.

Here are our goals. I think the other thing I'd like to say here too is that the research goals are important not only for the education research RFA, but also for both the research centers as well as the training grants.

So when you're thinking about putting together a training proposal, think about how the training you will provide to the students who participate in your program, how that will help them become scholars who can answer or who could put together proposals to address one, two, or more of the research goals I'm going to discuss.

Similarly for the research centers, think about how the questions that you are posing within your R&D center fit within our goal structure.

We have five research goals. The first four--(someone asked me this yesterday)—the first four do go in a developmental progression. But it's important to recognize that you are not required to start at goal one. You should come in to whichever goal makes sense given where your research question comes from.

The first goal is to identify or explore malleable factors, programs, practices, and policies associated with better student outcomes.

The first thing to do, if you're coming in under Goal 1, is to think about what components of instruction, what components of the curriculum, what policy components could be changed and are potentially associated with increased student outcomes.

We're going to talk in more detail about each of these goals. I think I'm going to just go through them first.

Our second goal, if you come in under Goal 2, is called development. And the intent here is to support the development of new education interventions. Again, please note that interventions should be understood broadly. Don't take this word narrowly. Because it could go again from the curriculum level, all the way up to the systemic level.

Our Goal 3 is to support research that proposes to evaluate the efficacy of interventions, either in a new or an original trial, if you will, to determine efficacy. Or in the context of a replication, perhaps there are already data to support efficacy but you would like to request funding to get to do more research in that area.

And our Goal 4 is to evaluate the impact of interventions when they're implemented at scale.

These are the largest grants that we support under our research goals. And these are really when you have an accumulation of evidence suggesting that your intervention is ready to be taken to scale and evaluated for the question of impact.

And finally, across I think all of our education research topics, we have a Goal 5, which is a measurement tool goal or assessment tool goal. This stands somewhat to the side, but the purpose really here is to support the development and validation of different kinds of tools that would be appropriate for different research topics.

I'm going to now go through each of the goals in turn, and try to talk a little bit about what the characteristics are of each of the goals.

I want to just sort of say that each of the examples that I give, and descriptions of the goals are meant only to be examples, and that depending on the particular topic that you're going to do, my examples may not fit terribly well.

So, I don't know if I've said this before, but I really want to encourage you to have this discussion of the research programs as a beginning point, and that you should really talk with the program officer, identified in the RFA or on the website, for the particular topic of interest—to contact them and talk with them further about your research project.

#### **Slide Twenty-five and Twenty six:**

Across our topics then, we have for Goal 1 our identification question. And here there are three possible types of questions you could explore.

You could propose to identify or explore programs, practices, and policies, that are associated with better student learning and achievement outcomes, to figure out which ones those are.

You could propose to examine or explore the factors and conditions that may mediate or moderate the relationships between student outcomes and these programs, practices, and policies.

So for example, perhaps you're interested in a student's language status, if you'd like to know whether that serves as a mediator or moderator for successful engagement with a particular type of curriculum.

And finally, you could propose to examine or explore malleable factors that are predictive of achievement and potentially amenable to intervention.

We have identified three possible types of activities that you could propose to complete under an identification goal.

One would be to make use of existing longitudinal data sets, such as the ECLS-K, for example.

Perhaps you have access to state or local data sets, and you could propose to use those data to capitalize on natural experiments or natural variations in education practices and policies.

So again, if you're looking at a data set that you're very familiar with, let's say a local or state dataset, you could say, well, I know that this particular curriculum was

introduced at this particular year. Let me look at the student achievement data and see whether in fact I'm seeing changes in student achievement in the direction we anticipate.

In addition, or separately, you could propose to conduct small-scale descriptive studies with primary data collection.

So, for example, for those of you who are familiar with the work that Carol Connor does in reading, that she and her colleague Fred Morrison began their research efforts spending useful substantial time in first grade language arts classrooms and collected detailed observational data both on teacher practices and on student practices, and then associated those with student outcomes.

And what emerged out of that work was an interesting work suggesting that certain teachers adjusted their instructional practices to students as a function of where they were in terms of their knowledge level. They then used that information to develop an intervention to help all teachers adjust their instruction to individual students.

So, depending upon your area, you could propose to conduct similar small-scale studies where you're gathering observational information and then associating that with student outcome data in order to propose to develop an intervention in the future.

And finally, for the first time this year, we have included the possibility that individuals can propose to conduct meta-analyses to explore malleable factors associated with positive education outcomes.

I want to make a note here that the role of completing meta-analyses under Identification is to identify things that one could propose to change in education practices. This is not intended to support the use of meta-analysis to support, say, a What Works Clearinghouse-type of conclusion, or to support any kind of efficacy project.

If you want to do efficacy work, that is under a separate goal.

Folks often want to know how much time and money is associated with Identification. If you're going to propose secondary data analyses, you can request up to two years' worth of funding. If you also intend to collect small-scale descriptive data, you can request up to four years' worth of funding.

The dollar amount for those projects is between \$150,000 to \$350,000 per year, including both direct and indirect costs. But know that those are not sort of firm and fixed numbers, that's just a set of guidelines. So if you need additional funds, you'd just need to explain why. If you could do it for less, that's okay as well.

### **Slide Twenty-seven:**

Goal 2. Under Goal 2, and this is the goal where we have supported the most research to date, we are requesting research projects that seek to develop new interventions. Again: interventions understood broadly, so this can include things like curricula, different instructional practices, programs, and policies.

The intent here is to support research that involves an iterative process. One of the things that any of you who've ever developed materials knows, that you can develop a curriculum that you think is the best, the best thing since sliced bread, you think it's really great, it's got all of this interesting information in it.

And then you test it out in the classroom, and it doesn't work as you thought it would. The teachers can't do the instruction, it takes too much time, and the kids look at the worksheets and go, "huh?"

We encourage researchers who put together Development proposals to explicitly describe the process through which they will be developing the materials, gathering information from teachers and students in classrooms to see whether in fact the intervention is operating as intended.

Another important part of Goal 2 is to describe theoretical foundations. So it's not enough to simply say we're going to develop this really cool new intervention, but to elaborate the theoretical foundations upon which this new set of materials is based upon being developed.

In addition, this year we are requesting that researchers propose to gather pilot data. Or, we're allowing, I should say, researchers to do this. It's not a requirement.

To gather pilot data demonstrating the feasibility of the intervention for implementation, again, in these authentic classrooms. And the promise, the goal here is to gather pilot data that illustrate the promise of the intervention for generating outcomes that the intervention is designed to affect

There is a restriction here, such that no more than 25 percent of your budget can be spent gathering pilot data. So this should be a small portion of the project.

In terms of years, you can request up to three years' worth of funding. And the total dollar amount, or the recommended dollar amounts are, I believe it's \$150,000 to \$500,000 per year for up to 3 years. Again, those are ranges, not firm and fixed.

#### **Slide Twenty-eight:**

Under Goal 3 -- I'm sure there are questions coming in about the goals. I'm going to go through all of the goals and then I'll come back and answer the questions in turn.

Under Goal 3, we support research efforts under efficacy and replication. The goal here is to support research where you are asking the causal questions. Whether an intervention that has been developed has been demonstrated to be feasible, whether in fact you are seeing a causal impact of that intervention on student achievement.

The way that we define efficacy within the Institute is the degree to which an intervention has a net positive impact on the outcomes of interest relative to the program or practice to which it is being compared.

We have a preference or expectation here for quasi-experimental or experimental research.

I also wanted to note that we do support replication efforts. One of the things that the institute has been trying to encourage researchers to do is to put in proposals that seek to replicate prior efficacy work with different populations of learners under different settings. So just know that that is a perfectly appropriate purpose.

The total dollar amounts for this, you can request up to four years' worth of funding. The dollar amount range is generally \$250,000 to \$750,000 per year in total direct and indirect costs.

#### **Slide Twenty-nine:**

Under Goal 4. So once you've got a lot of efficacy data, you've been gathering, conducting several efficacy and replication trials. You have quite a lot of evidence suggesting that your intervention is working to produce the student outcomes you'd like to see. You are prepared to come in to test an intervention at scale.



So here the goal is to ask the full causal question—the effectiveness question. And particularly, the critical dimension or distinction here besides size is that you're testing the effectiveness of an intervention when it is implemented under routine conditions by regular teachers and staff.

The idea here is that the program developer would not be providing any additional support above and beyond what a typical school district would receive.

Again, in this context, studies using randomized assignment to treatment and comparison conditions are strongly preferred.

I want to note that for both Goal 3 and Goal 4, you could also propose to evaluate interventions that are already in wide use but which do not have strong empirical or experimental data to support conclusions of efficacy or effectiveness. So I just wanted to make sure that you all were aware of that.

Under the scale-up evaluations, you can request up to five years' worth of funding, and you can request up to \$1.2 million per year to accomplish this work.

### **Slide Thirty:**

And last, but by no means least, we also have Goal 5, a measurement goal. The types of measures that can be developed do vary as a function of the topic to which you're applying.

We have four general categories here. And you will note that these vary as a function of the topic.

For the research topics that look at academic achievement generally, so things like the reading and writing topic, or the mathematics and science education topic, we support research that looks at developing, or that attempts to develop and validate screening, diagnosis, progress monitoring, or outcome assessment.

There's no requirement that propose to do all four, you can certainly propose to develop or evaluate only a screening instrument, or only an outcome instrument.

If you're interested in doing work under the teacher quality or education leadership topics, you could propose to develop or validate assessments of teachers, other service providers, or education leaders.

If you are working at the systems and policy level, or planning to propose under the education policy, finance, and systems level, you can propose to develop and test cost accounting tools that districts can use.

And finally, within the National Center for Special Education Research, you can propose to develop or validate accommodations for students with disabilities for large-scale assessments.

One of the questions we always have is, “What accommodations can allow students with disabilities to demonstrate that what they've learned?”

I think I'm going to -- that's my last slide.

In terms of money you can request up to four years for Goal 5, and I believe it's up to \$400,000 per year.

I've got a range of questions here, I'm going to start going through them.

What is the allowed project period for small-scale descriptive studies? Up to 4 years, if you're going to include the small-scale descriptive study.

For Goal 1, can you propose to conduct small-scale descriptive studies without also using longitudinal data sets? Again, the years and money. You are not required to use longitudinal data sets. However, if you are proposing to conduct small-scale descriptive studies, you need to draw a link between instructional processes that you're observing, and student outcomes.

Generally there will be some form of quantitative observational analysis that will be conducted, and that you draw this relationship between the student outcomes.

How many years and how much money? Again, I'm just going to restate this, it's up to four years if you do the original data collection. And the money is up to \$350,000 per year.

Under Goal 2, are control groups required? No. Goal two2, the purpose after goal two, is to develop the intervention. You can propose to collect pilot data. That's not a requirement. I would recommend that you talk with the program officer for your topic to think about an appropriate design for collecting pilot data.

Under Goal 3, do projects need randomized assignment of subjects? Under goal three Goal 3, you can propose either an experimental or quasi-experimental design. It does not need to occur at the level of the individual learner, however. Clearly that becomes challenging in the context of school projects.

So we have certainly supported a lot of research efforts where classrooms or teachers have been randomly assigned, or who are participating in a quasi-experimental design at the level of the school.

Under Goal 4, please clarify regular teachers: does that include special education teachers? Yes. Sorry, I'm not being clear in my language. What I meant there is that it shouldn't be your doc students in there delivering the instruction. It should be the classroom teacher, whether that teacher is a regular education teacher or a special education teacher.

Under Goal 5, the assessment goal, is it appropriate to submit an application for funding of a portion of the development of a new assessment? Or is it preferred that the proposal request funds for the entire development process, including standardization?

I actually do not believe that there's sufficient funds within our assessment goal to move to that standardization level. We're really not supporting the development of norms, necessarily. We really are trying to seed, if you will, the development of this new assessment tool and do some additional development and validation.

Your focus on methodologies seems largely statistical. Would IES consider funding studies, which explore other kinds of methodological approaches, such as unobtrusive observation, particularly within a special education context?

I'm going to turn to Kristen, because she's my special education expert here and is prepared to answer that question.

I'm not entirely sure what you mean by unobtrusive observation. Clearly, you can propose to collect observational data in the context of a goal one study, for example.

**Dr. LAUER:**

This is Kristen. I'm going to agree with, actually, what Liz just said, that you could definitely propose to collect observational data with goal one.

And with goal three and four, the efficacy and the scale-up goals, I think that sort of methodology would be difficult to do in order to meet the aims of those goals.

You could propose a mixed-method approach, where the observation would be perfectly appropriate to complement the study of the efficacy or the effectiveness of your intervention.

And then also within both goals three and four, you could propose some sort of single case, rigorous single case, research design as well. Particularly if you're thinking about, perhaps the classroom or school is the case, or if you're looking at instances where you're working with individuals' disabilities, low incidence disabilities.

I think it would be a situation where if you have a specific project or methodology in mind, you should probably contact the individual responsible for a research grant topic, and we can work with you from there.

**Dr. ALBRO:** The next question says, for Goal 2, can this include technology-intensive programs with commercial partners? The answer to that is yes. The key here is that if you are proposing a research project where a commercial partner is going to come in as a partner, you need to justify to the reviewers why it is that you need additional funding from the federal government to support the research that you're proposing to do.

Are matching or in-kind funding or resources required for each goal, and if so, is there a specific percentage of grant funds that is required? The answer is no; they are not required.

Take one more question, and I'm going to move on, because I don't want to run out of time here.

Is it appropriate to propose a project that addresses more than one goal? No. You need to select a goal because your proposal will be evaluated in relation to the goal that you submit.

If this is actually hard for folks to do, and this is the case where I would really recommend that you talk with your program officer, and they can help you think through which is the most appropriate goal given the research project that you'd like to do, and where you are in the process of your research plan.

I'm going to move on, because I do want to make sure we get through all the slides. But continue to send questions over chat if they occur to you as I'm talking.

### **Slide Thirty-one and Thirty two:**

Some of the nitty-gritty details that I want to make sure that you all think about, if you're considering preparing and submitting an application:

The first is to know where you can find RFAs. I think I mentioned this before, but here is the actual website. All of our requests for applications are available on our funding site on [ies.ed.gov](http://ies.ed.gov).

Please take the time to read the entire RFA. There's a tremendous amount of information that's available in them, both in terms of the topics, in terms of the requirements for the different goals, as well as details in terms of what you need to be including in each of the sections of your proposal that the reviewers will be considering when they're scoring your proposal.

Again, the news NewsFlash is a great way for you to get information about when new RFAs are available, when there will be additional webinars, etcetera.

**Slide Thirty-three:**

Here's the web page again, and I've circled in red there the two places where you can find our funding opportunities page and where you can sign up for the news NewsFlash.

**Slide Thirty-four:**

What about application packages? The Department of Education, as is true of most other federal agencies here, has moved to using the [www.grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov) portal. We do not accept paper applications any longer. Electronic submission is a requirement.

And you need to sign up on [grants.gov](http://grants.gov), get an account set up. And you need to check the RFAs with information about when the packages for the particular competition you're planning to submit to are available.

For the competitions which have June 26 deadlines, and I'll get to that in the next slide, those applications are available on [grants.gov](http://grants.gov). Please take the time to read the directions carefully.

There is information about what you need to include in the title line to make sure that your proposal is reviewed for the right competition, for the right topic, and for the right goal. So take some time to read that carefully.

**Slide Thirty-five:**

Here's the website if you haven't been there. Please, again, sign up. Start early, don't wait till the last minute.

**Slide Thirty-six:**

The other thing that I think is important to note here is that we're here to assist you. So all of the program officers within both of the research centers, we're all doctoral-level staff, we've all been involved in research. And we are here to help you through this process.

It's our goal to help develop high-quality research applications. So in order to do that, read the RFAs carefully. Talk to the program officers. Give a call or send us an e-mail, early in the process.

I'm going to give you my e-mail address right now, if you have questions, and I can forward them to appropriate program officers.

Know also that our program officers responsible for each topic are listed at the end through the last pages of the RFA, so all that information is there.

My e-mail, for folks who have questions, is elizabeth, E-L-I-Z-A-B-E-T-H .albro, A-L-B-R-O, @ed.gov.

We're pretty easy to find, and we're here. I know for many of us, e-mail is probably the easiest way to get in touch with us. And then we can setup a time for a longer call.

Finally, something that's unique again to IES, is that we are available for reviewing draft proposals. We have a separate office that handles our review process, so we can provide you with feedback and answer questions. So take advantage of us, that's what we're here for.

**Slide Thirty-seven:**

I know this is going to be a little repetitious, but I'm going to say it again. Remember, I have sort of this background in reading research and cognition, and so one of the things we know is that repetition is key for learning, so here. Read the request for application, and application instructions, and read them carefully.

There is a lot of information there, and you don't want your application to get tripped up because you didn't follow the directions. And believe me, it has happened.

Make sure you know if you're an eligible applicant.

Make sure you are aware of any special requirements that exist for the different requests for applications, say for the training grants, or for the evaluation of state and local district grants.

Pay attention to the content and formatting requirements. Two things that people often do is they try to put text, narrative text, in an appendix A or appendix B. If you do that, that information will be removed from your application. So read carefully the requirements in terms of what can be included in the appendices.

In terms of formatting, don't try to put in eleven and a half point font. It needs to be twelve-point font. Don't try to squeeze, change your margin spaces. Pages will be removed from your application to make it compliant. It's single spacing, so you could do single spacing.

Be sure to follow the directions for application submission and processing. Make sure you've included all the different sections. One of the reasons it's really important to go to [grants.gov](https://grants.gov) early is that you have to upload a series of separate PDFs. And you want to make sure you have time to upload everything, and to upload everything in the correct location.

### **Slide Thirty-eight:**

Finally, pay attention to due dates. Our due dates are firm and fixed. We don't give extensions. Applications are due on the date, June 26th, or October 2nd, by 4:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time. If you try to upload something at 4:31, it will be marked as late, and it will not go forward to review.

So, don't wait till the last day to upload your application; upload it several days in advance.

As promised, here are the due dates. For our education research RFAs for both the National Center for Education Research, and the National Center for Special Education Research, all topics and all goals can come in to one of two due dates: June 26th, or October 2nd.

One question we often get is whether you can put in a proposal for June 26th, and have time to revise and resubmit for the October 2nd deadline. There is not sufficient time for that, so don't plan on that as a strategy. If you put it in June, you probably will not receive notification of the status of your proposal before January of 2009.

For the second RFA up there, we have the Statistical and Research Methodology in Education: those proposals are due June 26th.

All of our other remaining RFAs have deadlines of October 2nd.

Let me talk quickly about the peer review process, and then I will address the questions.

**Slide Thirty-nine and Forty:**

Once you get your proposal in, you upload it to grants.gov, you've done it in time, what happens?

First, the application proposal will be reviewed for compliance. All of the questions of is the content in the right place, is the formatting correct, will be looked at and again reviewed.

The program staff will also do a quick review for compliance for topics, so we will make sure that your proposal is appropriate given the content, the topic area that you selected. And there will be a review to make sure that it's appropriate for the goal as well.

Again, these are reasons why it's important to talk with the program staff early, to make sure that your proposal is being submitted to the appropriate topic and appropriate goal.

Once proposals are determined to be compliant, and notwithstanding what I just said there which makes it sound really scary, the vast majority of proposals is compliant. Proposals are then assigned to a review panel.

We have standing review panels that are organized as a function of content area. So we have a reading panel, we have a mathematics and science panel, we have a panel that reviews our systems and policy proposals. There is also a special education panel.

And the number of panels that we bring in will depend upon the number of proposals that we receive.

Each application receives a primary review by two or three panel members. If you put in a Goal 3 or a Goal 4 proposal, you can be guaranteed that you will receive a third review. That third reviewer will be a methodologist who will review the design and proposed analysis that you've included in your application.

Then, after that first initial review is completed for all applications across all of the topic areas, the most competitive applications are then reviewed by the full panel at the panel meeting.

At that time, those panels are presented and scored by everyone present at the panel meeting.

**Slide Forty-one:**

Once the panel meetings are completed, and once the program staff has had access to the scores and made recommendations to the Director as to which proposals should receive funding or will receive funding, then all applicants receive e-mail notification of the status of their application.

Included with that e-mail will be copies of the reviewer comments.

And I think one of the important things to note is our funding rate is generally 10 to 12 percent. So clearly, not everyone gets funded the first time through.

If you are not granted an award the first time you put in a proposal, you should consider resubmitting, and talk with your program officer.

Although I don't have the numbers handy, I do know that grants that are resubmitted have a greater likelihood of being supported the second time through.

**Slide Forty-two:**

And I think that's my last slide. And again, this is the website to go to where the information is about RFAs.

I'm now going to answer these questions.

How long before application due dates are program officers able to read draft proposals? Different people have different restrictions. In part it depends upon how busy the program officer is. The best thing to do is to contact the individual program officer that is responsible for the topic area or the RFA that you are proposing putting into.

Are letters of intent required for all grant competitions? Letters of intent are not required. And certainly if there are folks on the phone who are considering applying to the June 26th deadline and miss the letter of intent, that is not a reason to not submit on June 26th.

Letters of intent (LOIs) serve the purpose of helping program officers know who's intending to apply so that they can reach out to them and talk to them about their project.

It also helps us know the number and types of reviewers that we need to make sure are available for the review process.

So if you did not send in an LOI but are interested in submitting to the June 26th deadline, I would encourage you to contact the program officer for the relevant competition.

Since this is the Department of Education, can we use Department of Education personnel for letters of support? It depends I think upon which competition you're proposing to. But really, the letters of support that we request are from schools and districts to indicate their willingness to participate in the research project.

It's hard for me to think off the top of my head of a context where a Department of Education letter of support would be relevant to the review process.

Is there a predetermined cut score for final competitive proposals? No there is not. In general, we support research that is evaluated to be outstanding or excellent quality, but we do not have a firm and fixed cut score.

Here's this next question, says, If your project involves multiple research studies, each one dependent on results of the previous study, what are the RFA requirements in terms of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval? Is the research narrative sufficient, or do we need to have IRB approval from our institution?

We do not require IRB approval at the time of application. However, you will need to get IRB approval if you are recommended for funding. That is part of the process of issuing the grant support, is going through that IRB process at your institution.

Are there caps on the percent of indirect that can be calculated for a proposed budget? In general, there are not. You can use your standard indirect research rate.

We do, however, also encourage researchers and institutions to look at their indirect cost agreements and to see whether there are appropriate opportunities for using the off-campus indirect rate as appropriate.

Certain of these studies, particularly the efficacy and scale-up proposals, have been happening off-site, and it may be possible to use the off-campus rate.

Are any of these opportunities considered career grants? I'm assuming this is referring to the NSF career grant program. We do not actually have any programs that are specifically targeting junior investigators. So junior investigators are evaluated along the same criteria as more senior investigators.

I will let you know, however, that we do support a fair number of junior investigators, particularly for the Goal 1 identification projects.

This is a question again for matching or in-kind funding resources. Those are not required under these research grants. So that's not an issue.

What are the review panel members' qualifications/expertise and background? From what types of institutions? And who are they, and is it public information?

The review panel members are individuals who have worked with the requisite content and methodological expertise to evaluate according to the request for application. Generally these are researchers who have experience conducting the kind of research that IES supports.

However, you probably have noticed that the type of research that we support does range. Research skills required for a secondary data analysis, under Goal 1, are not the same as the skills required for doing the measurement, and those in turn are different from the types of skills that are important for an efficacy study.

We try to make sure that our panels are staffed by individuals with that diversity of knowledge, as it were, that's required to evaluate appropriately.

There is information available on panel members. It is available under the IES Director home page, under the Office of Standards and Review. If you can't find it, go ahead and send me an e-mail, and I'll send you the direct link.

To what extent is IES review of the human subjects compliance conducted above and beyond institutional board review? There's sort of a two-step level process here, but I don't know if it's above and beyond rather, or as opposed to, sort of a parallel process.

All of the grants that we recommend for funding do need to go through the Department of Ed's IRB processes as well. And they really are looking to see whether human subjects are involved, which they usually are, and what degree of IRB approval is required.

Then our IRB office contacts the university or the research institution and requests that IRB approval documentation be sent to the Department of Ed.

I hope that answers your question.

You folks have any other questions about either the goals or the topics or anything else that I covered or not covered in the conversation so far this morning?

For Goal 4, can any funding be used for program implementation? Yes, for purchasing the curricula to be evaluated. Yes, they can be. Again, however, you need to explain, justify the need for that.

Sometimes what can occur is that if you're evaluating a commercially available curriculum, and you're going to be evaluating that curriculum, reviewers will often expect to see the delivery of that curriculum at cost, with no profit in there, because of course it may be to the benefit of the commercial publisher.

It's something that you need to talk about, but you can clearly use a portion of the funds requested under scale-up for the purchase of curricula.

Does the department's IRB standard differ from the OHRP standard? I don't know off the top of my head. Again, this has not been something that we've encountered, that I personally have encountered difficulties with.

In general, the Department's IRB office is in touch with you if your proposal is recommended for funding. There are not generally points of disagreement.



I'm going to read this question back, but I'm going to have to turn this over to Kristen here. This question says, for autistic spectrum disorders, is the focus only on academic achievement, or social development?

**Dr. LAUER:** The focus of the autism spectrum disorders topic is to develop, or evaluate, or even develop measures, that are comprehensive programs or measures, for children with autism.

They can focus on more than one outcome. You could certainly propose a project that focuses on both academic achievement and social development goals.

But if you were going to choose to do one or the other, you should probably talk to the contact, Celia Rosenquist. And she can either figure out a way to fit your project under the autism spectrum disorders topic, or it may be a better fit under, for example, our reading, writing, and language development topic, or our social context for academic learning topic.

I would recommend that you go ahead and give Celia a call and discuss this with her.

**Dr. ALBRO:** The next question I have here says, will the webinars be archived for viewing at a later date? It is my understanding that the webinar slides will be posted. And there will be an audio that will accompany it at some point. I don't have an exact date for when that will occur.

And then the next question is, will you be adding another webinar on grant writing, since both sessions are full? I do not believe that we have plans to add another one at this time. But, as I said, the information for those sessions will also be posted. So slides and audio will be posted on the web after we've done those sessions.

Under the special topic on literacy, does the research have to address both readers and writers, or can it address only one group? I think it can look at only reading or only writing; it does not have to include both.

You guys have any other questions out there? I think you have to be able to type faster than you probably can, right? If you have questions.

We can do our good wait time. We're all teachers, or at least many of us have been teachers. We'll do a wait time to make sure that we give everyone an opportunity to send in questions.

Well, if nobody has any other questions, I think I'm going to go ahead and sign off.

Like I said, if you have particular questions that I can be of help with, please feel free to send me an e-mail directly.

If you have already identified who the relevant program officer is for the topic that you are interested in applying to, please do contact them directly. They could provide you with the most appropriate and detailed advice about the project that you're proposing to put together.

Thanks for your attention. And we hope it was useful for you. And we hope to get lots of applications from those of you on the phone.

So, have yourself a great day, and thanks again.

(Whereupon, the above matter was concluded.)